



New Hampshire Housing and Conservation Planning Program

Office of Energy and Planning, 57 Regional Drive, Concord, NH 03301
Voice: 603-271-2155, Fax: 603-271-2615, TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964
www.nh.gov/oep/programs/HCPP/

ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Monday, October 1, 2007
Office of Energy and Planning
57 Regional Drive, Concord, NH

FINAL MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT OCTOBER 1, 2007

Senator Martha Fuller Clark, HCPP Advisory Board Chair, appointed by NH State Senate
Maura Adams, The Jordan Institute, appointed by The Jordan Institute
Richard Ball, Cirtronics Corporation, appointed by Business and Industry Association of NH
Representative Timothy Butterworth, appointed by NH House of Representatives
Dean Christon, NH Housing Finance Authority, appointed by NH Housing Finance Authority
Christopher Closs, C.W. Closs & Co., appointed by NH Main Street Program
Jeffrey D. Gilbert, W.J.P. Development, LLC, appointed by NH Preservation Alliance
Ellen Kambol, Windy Hill Associates, appointed by NH Community Loan Fund
William Norton, Norton Asset Management, appointed by Land and Community Heritage Commission
Kenneth Ortmann, Rochester Dept. of Planning and Development, appointed by NH Municipal Association
David Preece, Southern NH Planning Commission, appointed by NH Association of Regional Planning
Commission Executive Directors
Chris Wells, Society for the Protection of NH Forests, appointed by Society for the Protection of NH Forests

OTHERS PRESENT

Jennifer Czysz, NH Office of Energy and Planning, appointed as program administrator

I. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Christon called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM on October 1, 2007 at the NH Office of Energy and Planning, 57 Regional Drive, Concord, NH.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: MOVED by Mr. Closs, seconded by Rep. Butterworth, THAT the minutes of the Advisory Board meeting held on September 10 and 14, 2007 be approved. The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 12-0.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

The Advisory Board reviewed the draft administrative rules dated September 25, 2007 and distributed by email on that same date. Conversation began with a review of edits to Pln 1005.05 on page 7 followed by Pln 1007.02 on page 9 through the end of the draft rules.

Notable decisions reached include:

- Pln 1006.02 (k), *page 8* – Revise as follows: “...completed **consistent with the 10 HCPP principles stated in RSA 4-C:30** either through ~~successful~~ participation...”
- Pln 1007.02, *pages 9-12* – Replace all citations of “will plan for” with “intends to plan for.”
- Pln 1007.02, *pages 9-12* – Utilize the scoring options listed under (a) for all applicable questions. Scoring options presented under (b) and (c) will not be used.
- Pln 1007.02, *pages 9-10* – Swap items (a) and (b) in order so that the rules place the smart growth evaluation item second to the overarching HCPP program objective criteria.
- Pln 1007.02 (d), *page 10* – insert “and historic” into “...sensitive natural **and historic** areas...”
- Pln 1007.02 (f), *page 10* – insert “and historic” into “...between natural **and historic** resources...”
- Pln 1007.02 (j), *page 11* – Edit this criteria to clarify that the community input and education process is to occur during the planning process as approved by HCPP.
- Pln 1007.02 (k), *page 11* – It was decided that the priority scoring for completion of previous stages should be limited to those that have done so only through the HCPP program to encourage those communities the State has made an investment in to continue through all stages. Additionally, “successful” should be struck and add the requirement that the work had to be performed consistent with the HCPP principles of RSA 4-C:30. The scoring should be limited to 2 points if yes and 0 points if no.
- Pln 1007.02 (m), *page 11* – Replace “regional perspective” with “multi-jurisdictional perspective.” Modify the scoring so that (1) grants 4 points for joint applications, (2) grants 2 points for utilizing a multi-jurisdictional perspective, and strike (3). Additionally, (1), (2), and (4) should be edited to reflect the wording used in Pln 1007.02 (a).
- Pln 1007.02 (n), *page 11* – Delete criteria (n) as it is too difficult to quantify and redundant with the established scoring methodology that is already capable of awarding exception applications.
- Pln 1007.02 (o), *page 12* – This criteria needs to be edited to generalize the point scoring options and ensure balance between housing and conservation groups as well as between municipal boards, the public and other support. A cap on points allowed under this criteria to ensure it is not granting a disproportionately greater amount of points than the other scoring criteria.
- Pln 1007.02 (p), *page 12* – Delete criteria (p) as it is too difficult to quantify and redundant with the established scoring methodology that is already capable of awarding exception applications.
- Pln 1007.03, *page 12* – While geographic distribution is ideal in theory, it would be difficult to implement and may deny funding to communities with a greater need.
- Pln 1007.03, *page 12* – Delete item (c) as it is unnecessary.
- Pln 1007.03 (b), *page 12* – Delete the word “significantly” found in (1) as it is subjective. Replace “principles of the HCPP” with a reference to the statutory section that lists the principles.
- Pln 1007.03 (d), *page 13* – Add to the end of this item “...and those applications that were not funded due to a lack of HCPP funds, but were valid and would have been funded otherwise, will be retained for subsequent grant rounds when funds may next be available.”

- Pln 1008.01 (f), *page 13* – Strike “at six month intervals following contract execution” and replace it with “as negotiated and specified in the contract”

Other notable decisions reached and not specifically attributable to a section of the rules include:

- If an application is to exceed the requirements we want them to exceed in scope not in their volume of application materials.
- It will be essential to prepare good guidance packet to accompany application forms. Guidance materials should also include the statute and administrative rules.
- OEP should develop an evaluation methodology to be used at the completion of HCPP funded work. The evaluation would serve to guide municipalities future work and provide insight into returning applicants for successive stages. The evaluation form could also be used by potential applicants to assess previous work they completed independently and progress they have made toward completion of the various stages, prior to submitting an application.
- OEP should develop a method of recognizing communities that have “done it all.” This might include recognition at OEP conferences or governor issued planning awards. Until the time that communities are completing stage 4, OEP can recognize those communities funded by HCPP.
- Guidance material should note that data collected during stage 1 may become outdated if a community does not progress through to stage 4 in a timely manner.
- OEP should acknowledge, either by phone, mail, or email, receipt of interim and final reports submitted by the municipality.

IV. MEETING SCHEDULE

The board members decided upon the following meeting schedule:

October 15, 2007: 9:30AM to 11:30 AM – administrative rules working session
October 29, 2007: 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM – review progress / finalize rules discussion
November 26, 2007: 9:30AM to 11:30 AM – preparations for administrative rules public hearing
December 17, 2007: 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM – tentative public hearing date

All meetings will be held at the Office of Energy and Planning, 57 Regional Drive, Concord, NH, unless otherwise noticed.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jennifer Czysz, Senior Planner
Office of Energy and Planning

JC